

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Robert Nasser for the telephonic interview with Applicants' representatives, Laura Johnson and Paul Lee, on February 27, 2009 to discuss the pending application.

### Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None.

### Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 34 and 38.

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 5,372,133 to Hogen Esch and U.S. Patent No. 5,706,807 to Picha.

### Proposed Amendments

None.

### Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicants' representatives discussed why claims 34 and 38 were believed to be distinguishable over the references cited in the last Office Action. Applicants argued that by modifying the Hogen Esch device by encasing the device in an angiogenic layer would result in the angiogenic layer being deposited onto the cap 30, rather than onto an electrode, and pointed out that Figure 4 of Hogen Esch shows a device configured to have a spacing/gap between the cap 30 and the electrodes 7, 9.

### Results of Interviews

Applicants' representatives agreed to submit arguments in a formal response explaining how Claims 34 and 38 are distinguishable over the references cited in the last Office Action.